

Message

From: Bonita Stewart [bonita@google.com]
Sent: 7/12/2019 2:58:39 PM
To: Alex Bergersen [bergersen@google.com]
CC: Rahul Srinivasan [rahulsr@google.com]; Suzanne Blackburn [suzblackburn@google.com]; Noam Wolf [nwolf@google.com]; Dorothee Bergin [dorob@google.com]; Medha Vedaprakash [medhav@google.com]; Jason Bigler [bigler@google.com]; Nitish Korula [nitish@google.com]; Sagnik Nandy [sagnik@google.com]; Giulio Minguzzi [gminguzzi@google.com]; Chris LaSala [chrisl@google.com]; Jason Washing [jwashing@google.com]; Brad Bender [bradbender@google.com]; Alex Shellhammer [ashellhammer@google.com]; Jonathan Meltzer [meltzerj@google.com]; Lauren Ashcraft [lashcraft@google.com]
Subject: Re: Heads up: negative op-ed from News Corp coming in AdExchanger

Privileged and Confidential

100% agreed on this approach. We also would prefer to remove commentary from email threads as we have separate partner update meetings with the support of counsel to address situations as they arise.

B

On Thu, Jul 11, 2019 at 4:20 PM Alex Bergersen <bergersen@google.com> wrote:

Privileged and Confidential

Hi all,

Redacted - Privilege

Thanks!

Alex

On Wed, Jul 10, 2019 at 6:50 PM Rahul Srinivasan <rahulsr@google.com> wrote:

Dorothee and Lauren already have a doc that handles these objections. Also, just a side note, outside #2 (from Dorothee's email), none of these claims are really related to the 1P launch.

On Wed, Jul 10, 2019 at 6:46 PM Suzanne Blackburn <suzblackburn@google.com> wrote:

Can you share the messaging / facts we are using to counter those specific claims? That would be helpful to have handy.

On Wed, Jul 10, 2019, 6:39 PM Noam Wolf <nwolff@google.com> wrote:

Yup we've heard these in person (and on Twitter) and we've addressed every single case over and over again.

We have OB, our adserver works with HB (albeit with friction), AdX and DFP are a single product, and there's a firewall between us and AdWords.

She doesn't believe us so there's not much we can do. It's interesting, though, that other NewsCorp subsidiaries support 1p and are generally happy with our services.

I'm not a lawyer or a PR person but this angle of hers seems to be extremely personal, negotiating logically with someone like that can never lead to acceptance or agreement.

On Wed, Jul 10, 2019, 6:30 PM Dorothée Bergin <dorob@google.com> wrote:

+1 that the counter points are great. We added them to Philipp's brief in case this comes up in his meeting tomorrow in Sun Valley.

In terms of News Corp's allegations, Steph's comments usually focus on three themes:

- AdX not integrating with prebid / header bidding is anti-competitive: Steph is very vocal that in order to create a fair, competitive marketplace, Google demand needs to be available independent from the ad server (ie via an HB integration). She has said she would like to switch ad servers, but is "forced to use DFP in order to access AdWords demand optimall

Unified

- Floors: News Corp would like to be able to set floors by partner, and does not think Google should be influencing these business decisions for them.
- Continued lack of trust in separation between AdManager and AdWords: News Corp believes that AdWords is receiving more information from Google (within the Ad Manager auction and across the broader Google user ecosystem), giving AdWords an unfair advantage to bid more intelligently than other buyers.

On Wed, Jul 10, 2019 at 6:11 PM Medha Vedaprakash <medhav@google.com> wrote:

Well, their general counsel , David pitofsky in his testimony urged Congress to follow the money trail in digital advertising. They use the same narrative that we play on both sides of the marketplace and also, compete with pubs at the same time.

Off note and just fyi that Philipp, Sundar are meeting with news corp's CEO tomorrow at sun valley.

On Wed, Jul 10, 2019, 6:02 PM Jason Bigler <bigler@google.com> wrote:

How fair and balanced of them.

On Wed, Jul 10, 2019, 5:59 PM Suzanne Blackburn <suzblackburn@google.com> wrote:

Re/ allegations, we'll probably see some claims that we're doing this to benefit our demand side platforms, or grow revenue in general, and take control away from publishers. Dorothee may know more specifics.

Update: Op-Ed is publishing tomorrow. I'm pushing to see it first to "fact check" but it will be a miracle if they let me do that. :)

Suzanne Blackburn Global Communications & Public		
Affairs		suzblackburn@google.com [REDACTED] (cell)

On Wed, Jul 10, 2019 at 5:53 PM Noam Wolf <nwolff@google.com> wrote:

On Wed, Jul 10, 2019, 5:46 PM Nitish Korula <nitish@google.com> wrote:

Thanks, Suzanne and Rahul. There are times I seriously think News Corp is more trouble than they're worth. :)

That won't change if they're not on platform though right? ;)

Suzanne, do we have any sense of what the anti-competitive allegations will be? +1 that the talking points are great.

Nitish

On Wed, Jul 10, 2019 at 5:45 PM Sagnik Nandy <sagnik@google.com> wrote:

+1 The points look both very reasonable and solid.

On Wed, Jul 10, 2019 at 2:33 PM Noam Wolf <nwolf@google.com> wrote:

Never a dull moment.

Thanks for sharing, the points are solid IMO and we should continue broadcasting them.

On Wed, Jul 10, 2019, 5:06 PM Rahul Srinivasan <rahulsr@google.com> wrote:

+Nitish Korula +Noam Wolf +Sagnik Nandy fyi

On Wed, Jul 10, 2019 at 5:00 PM Giulio Minguzzi <gminguzzi@google.com> wrote:

+Chris LaSala FYI

On Wed, Jul 10, 2019 at 4:45 PM Suzanne Blackburn <suzblackburn@google.com> wrote:

Hi all-

Wanted to give you a heads up that AdExchanger plans to publish a negative op-ed from News Corp with some anti-competitive claims about our first price auction roll-out. Timing is TBD -- their editor told me "some time this week."

Jason Bigler did two interviews in the past week on this topic, and his interview with AdExchanger is expected to publish tomorrow. It will be interesting to see which piece they publish first.

We're expecting this to come up in some competition-related issues in DC -- our counter points on this topic are below.

Many thanks to the partner team for the early heads up on this.

Let me know if you have any questions,
Suzanne

Q: Is Google's move to first price auctions anti-competitive?

- Not at all. It will actually increase competition for publisher inventory and potentially increase publishers ad revenue by reducing artificial barriers to certain demand sources.

- Publishers have been a part of our product development process. Many of the features we're building into the product are features our publisher partners have asked us to build.
- We've hosted user focus groups with 400 partners worldwide to discuss this rollout and get input on this launch. We have already adjusted some aspects of the program because of the feedback we received during the user focus groups.
- News Corp is an outlier. Most publishing partners and even some of our competitors are supportive of the move to first price auction and unified pricing. [Check out this blog post](#).
- Google is the last of the major programmatic exchanges to move to first price auctions. OpenX, Index Exchange, AppNexus, etc have been operating as first price auctions for years.
- It's important to note that as part of this change, we will be removing the "last look" that Ad Manager Auction demand and Exchange Bidding demand had over other non-guaranteed indirect demand (including Header Bidding). This means that the auction will have consistent rules for all advertising demand (including Google demand).
- A lack of transparency is one of the most common complaints we hear about the ad tech ecosystem. Google's move to first price auctions is a big step towards increased transparency and will allow publishers to accurately assess the true market value of their inventory.

Suzanne Blackburn | Global Communications & Public Affairs | suzblackburn@google.com | [REDACTED] (cell)

--

Giulio Minguzzi

gminguzzi@google.com

--
Dorothée Bergin
Strategic Partner Lead, Global Partnerships
dorob@google.com
212.381.5026

Alex Bergersen | Competition Counsel (secondee) | bergersen@google.com | 202-412-4774

ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION, ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT

--

Bonita C. Stewart
Vice President, Global Partnerships

bonita@google.com
212-565-4052 Office
[REDACTED] Mobile



'This email may be confidential or privileged. If you received this communication by mistake, please don't forward it to anyone else, please erase all copies and attachments, and please let me know that it went to the wrong person. Thanks.'

'The above terms reflect a potential business arrangement, are provided solely as a basis for further discussion, and are not intended to be and do not constitute a legally binding obligation. No legally binding obligations will be created, implied, or inferred until an agreement in final form is executed in writing by all parties involved.'